

Customer No. 22,852
Application No. 10/581,364
Attorney Docket No. 02887.0402

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached Replacement Sheet includes an amended FIG. 16 that replaces the original FIG. 16. An arrow is added to show the directional flow of Block s10 in amended FIG. 16. No new matter has been added.

Attachment: One (1) Replacement Sheet - original FIG. 15 and amended FIG.

16.

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed December 22, 2010, the Examiner took the following actions:

- (1) objected to the drawings;
- (2) rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite;
- (3) rejected claims 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter;
- (4) rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,064,424 to van Berkel et al. ("Berkel"); and
- (5) rejected claims 2-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berkel in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA");

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 9-11, 13, 14, 16, and 18-20. Claims 1-20 remain pending and under current examination. Applicants respectfully traverse the objection and rejections made in the Office Action.

I. **Objection to the Drawings**

The Office Action objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) and asserted that the drawings fail to show "directional flow of the block[] S10." Office Action, p. 2. In response, and without conceding to the Office Action's assertions, Applicants submit one (1) replacement drawing sheet, including amended Fig. 16, which shows the directional flow of Block s10. The replacement drawing fully complies with 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(d) and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Office Action, pp. 3-4. In response, and without conceding to the Office Action's assertions, Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 9-11, 14, 16, and 18-20. The amended claims have proper antecedent basis. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Office Action, pp. 5-6. As suggested by the Examiner, and without conceding to the Office Action's allegation, Applicants have amended claims 18-20 to recite "a non-transitory computer-readable medium." Therefore, claims 18-20 are drawn to statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Berkel. In order to establish anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Office Action must show that each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in Berkel. See M.P.E.P. § 2131. Berkel, however, does not disclose each and every element of Applicants' claims.

Contrary to the Examiner's allegations, Berkel does *not* disclose at least Applicants' claimed "stereoscopic image data structure" that comprises, among other things:

a parallax component image data representing n or more parallax component images, each having accumulated pixels that cause the pixels to generate parallel light rays in the same parallax direction in the viewing zone, and having different numbers of horizontal pixels,

wherein n combined images with the same numbers of vertical and horizontal pixels are a unit to be converted into a parallax interleaved image, the n combined images being formed by combining one or more parallax component images with parallax directions different from each other by n,

as recited in amended claim 1.

The Office Action appears to interpret Berkel's "colour pixels re-arranged," which is illustrated in Fig. 5A or Fig. 5B, as corresponding to the claimed "parallax component image." Office Action, p. 7. This interpretation is incorrect.

First, although Fig. 5A and Fig. 5B of Berkel show that "[t]he display elements in one row of the array of the LC display panel ... all display the same colour," Berkel does not disclose "accumulated pixels that cause the pixels to generate parallel light rays in the same parallax direction in the viewing zone," as recited in claim 1. Nor does Berkel disclose that each parallax component image has "different numbers of horizontal pixels." In contrast, Fig. 5A and Fig. 5B of Berkel show that the horizontal pixels in each row are identical.

Furthermore, Fig. 5A and Fig. 5B of Berkel do not disclose that "n combined images with the same numbers of vertical and horizontal pixels are a unit," as recited by

claim 1. The Office Action appeared to interpret that the “r, g, b in dashed lines in fig. 5B” as corresponding to the claimed “unit” of “n combined images.” Office Action, p. 7. However, none of those dashed-lined blocks has “the same numbers of vertical and horizontal pixels,” as recited by claim 1. Nor are these dashed-lined blocks “formed by combining one or more parallax component images with **parallax directions different from each other by n,**” as recited by claim 1 (emphasis added).

For at least the above reasons, Berkel fails to disclose or even suggest each and every recitation of amended claim 1. As such, Berkel does not anticipate claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), and the claim should therefore be allowed.

V. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Berkel and AAPA. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to any of these claims.

As noted above, Berkel fails to disclose or suggest all of the claim recitations of independent claim 1. Independent claims 2, 14, 16, and 18-20, while of different scope, include recitations similar to those discussed above regarding independent claim 1. For example, claims 2, 14, 16, and 18-20 each recite “a parallax component image.” Therefore, Berkel does not disclose or suggest all of the claim recitations of each of independent claims 2, 14, 16, and 18-20. Furthermore, AAPA was cited by the Examiner merely for the alleged teaching that the “n combined images is recorded.” Office Action, p. 8. Therefore, AAPA does not cure the deficiencies of Berkel identified above and thus claims 2, 14, 16, and 18-20 are allowable over Berkel and AAPA.

Dependent claims 3-13, 15, and 17 are not obvious over the cited references, at least by virtue of being dependent from allowable independent claims 2, 14, and 16, and because they recite additional features not taught or suggested by the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 21, 2011

By: /Jiayu Song/
Jiayu Song
Ltd. Rec. No. L0500
(202) 408-4464

Attachments: One (1) Replacement Sheet containing original FIG. 15 and amended FIG. 16.